

WASHINGTON SENTINEL.

DL XXVIII.

WASHINGTON CITY D. C. SATURDAY APRIL 13 1901

NO 41

Washington Sentinel.

Published and Edited by

LOUIS SCHADE.

APPEARS EVERY SATURDAY.



TERMS

\$3 per year for single copy sent by mail to subscribers, payable in advance

RATES OF ADVERTISING:

First insertion, one inch, \$1.50; second insertion, 75 cents; Liberal deductions for annual advertisements. Special notices 25 cents a line.

Advertisements to insure insertion \$10.00, to be handed in not later than 12 o'clock noon on Thursday. Office: No. 600 F Street, N. W., Washington, D. C. Sample copies mailed upon application. Address LOUIS SCHADE, Washington D. C.

OHIO IN THE VAN.

Brewers Organizing to Meet their Enemies.

At the breaking out of the war with Spain brewers objected to being taxed an additional dollar per barrel on beer for military purposes because they were already paying a war tax, and they felt in all fairness that they should not be asked to do more until all other sources of revenue had been exhausted. There was nothing unreasonable in this demand, but it did not appeal favorably to legislators, because the brewing industry offered facilities for easy and large collections possessed by few other callings. Therefore reasonable and just objections had to give way to the demands of expediency and the tax was imposed. Let this should be accused of lack of patriotism in the face of the Government's necessities, brewers had yielded to the inevitable, and for their sacrifices were assured that the weight would be lifted as soon as the war was over.

If ever the truth of an old saying was proved it has been in this case, for truly brewers have found out that "promises, like pie crusts, are made to be broken." The war ended in Cuba and another was begun in the Philippines. Now the latter is about over. Will the tax be repealed? Not if this Administration can prevent it. It has too many friends to be rewarded, too many obligations to be repaid.

Congress provided for an army of 100,000 men at a cost of \$100,000,000. Cessation of hostilities in the Philippines gave hope for a reduction of our military establishment to 60,000 men, at a saving of \$40,000,000 a year. This course would have provided at once for the total repeal of the beer tax. It was reasonable to expect such a policy would be followed, for if a war could be waged to a successful conclusion with 65,000 men, certainly 60,000 would suffice for police purposes in time of peace. But such a reduction would offer no excuse for a continuance of taxes, and repeal would cut off the golden stream which furnishes the means to reward political favorites, therefore taxes must continue. How to do it was the question.

Where there's a will there's a way. The army will be increased to 75,000 and maintained at that figure—July 15,000 men more are to be utilized in maintaining peace than in waging war. This is an apparent decrease of 25 per cent on the number appropriated for by Congress. It should reduce expenditures by that amount and open a way for the wiping out of \$25,000,000 of war taxes. Will it do so? Let it should, the War Department decreases the numerical strength of companies to 80 men instead of the maximum, thus necessitating the recruiting of the original number of regiments, the appointment of as many officers as originally provided for, and the absorption in unnecessary military expenses of millions that could be used in lessening the burdens of oppressed taxpayers. Who cares? The brewers can pay the bills.

The Chinese question has progressed to the point of collecting indemnities. Our Government claims to have spent \$25,000,000 in that adventure, actual expenses. Other Governments have preferred claims whose total sums up \$400,000,000 (expenses and penalties)—twice as much as China can pay. Every dollar of our share will have to be made good out of the pockets of American taxpayers. No one could accuse us of wishing to reap profit out of China's misfortunes by insisting on repayment of this country's expenditures, and a proper regard for the interests of our people demands such a course. If forbearance is necessary, why

should it not be practised by those powers whose bills are notoriously padded? It should not be exercised at the expense of our Treasury.

Our surplus is large, but if we have money to burn, let it be dissipated in lightening the load under which we are travelling. Besides, \$25,000,000 would justify a repeal by the next Congress of the beer tax, if the Administration were honest in its expressed desire to bring about such relief.

But will Congress be left in a position to take action? Not if Mr. McKinley can help it. In the largeness of his heart and with the liberality customary in the handling of other people's money, he proposes to smooth the way for a settlement of the troubles to the advantage of other powers by scaling our just claims \$12,500,000, on condition that his allies do likewise with their unjust ones. He does not propose to go before the coming Congress with too large a surplus on hand. It may tax his ability to the utmost to do so, but he will do his best to get rid of it. Why should he not? He can make the brewers pay the bills.

These are small matters, but they serve to show that the sympathy of the Administration is not with the people in a demand for lower taxes. If relief comes, it must be wrung from the ruling powers—they will never willingly concede it.

Signs are multiplying, however, that brewers are on the point of rebelling. Ominous rumblings are heard from the President's own State, and unless indications prove most deceptive Ohio will lead the way in a revolt against the policy and the practices of the Republican party, in city, State and nation, that will make the leaders of that party regret their broken promises to the industry that sacrificed its material welfare on the altar of patriotism only to be kicked and cuffed and oppressed the more by those who profited by its generosity.

Wisconsin, too, will remember Speaker Henderson's hasty summons to Milwaukee to check the feeling of resentment against McKinley because of his foreign policies and the blood and treasure they consumed—a feeling which threatened disaster to the Republican national ticket—which the Speaker allayed with the promise that with the election of McKinley—and only in this contingency—would repeal of taxation come. It will be easily recalled how this promise was kept—25 cents a barrel is not repeal, it is not even a reduction in view of the changed industrial conditions following in war's train—and the remembrance will put Wisconsin in line with Ohio's brewers in a demand for present relief for their business and security in the future. Other States also will recall the pledges of Republican leaders made when the tax was levied and unfulfilled to this day. They, too, will be found in line with Ohio in a fight for right and justice. As the Chicago American Brewer said recently, "There is a limit to all things, and the time will come when right triumphs over might and a stop is put to the unjust discriminations of our present Congressmen." That time has come, and a Columbus despatch to the Washington Evening Star indicates that the men are here also.

There is one way in which the tax will be repealed, and only one—and that way is by a resort to the ballot box.

Trusts in Europe.

The craze to centralize power for the control of industrial production, the alleged virtues of which are being so ably expatiated upon in Washington by the high priests of combinations, has taken a fresh hold in Europe, according to the report of United States Consul Mahin, at Reichenberg, Austria. One of the latest trusts is in the linen spinning industry, and it is aimed presumably to advance prices by a restriction of the output. Already manufacturers of linen fabrics have suffered through higher prices, and the promise of a further increase in this direction threatens to bring about a crisis among producers of the finished goods.

These facts sustain the universal verdict, which promoters are trying vainly to overthrow, that a trust is not a philanthropic institution. By reducing its wage rolls and increasing the cost of its wares to the consumer it constructs a substantial bridge to carry it over its watered capital and insure a large return to its promoters.

CUBA HAS ACTED.

She Will Not Accept the Platt Amendment.

The Cuban Constitutional Convention has rejected the demands of the United States as set forth in the Platt amendment to the Army Appropriation bill. Only two of the twenty-six members of the convention were in favor of granting the concessions which the Fifty-sixth Congress named as the price of "Cuban independence." The convention has acted after due deliberation, the matter of Cuba's relations with the United States having been under consideration ever since the Fifty-sixth Congress adopted the Platt amendment, in the latter part of February.

The rejection of the demands of Congress, we are informed by newspapers in touch with the Administration, "created no surprise in official circles in Washington." Evidently the "powers behind the throne" reason that if the United States can find some pretext for prolonging the military occupation of the island it is immaterial whether the Cubans accept the terms proposed to them as a condition precedent to the control of their Government. Under the existing arrangement the United States is the supreme power in Cuba. Under the provisions of the Platt amendment the Cubans would enjoy a "limited independence" under the protection and restraint of the United States. Their right to make treaties with foreign powers is restricted by the Platt amendment, as is also their power to contract debt. They must, in accordance with the declaration of Congress, recognize the right of the United States to intervene in the event of disorder in the island. They must sell or lease coaling and naval stations to the United States, and they must not claim the Isle of Pines as part of the constitutional boundaries of Cuba.

The Washington correspondent of the Philadelphia Press informs the readers of that stanch Republican newspaper and expansionist journal that the property-owning Cubans are practically unanimous in their approval of the Platt amendment. According to this authority only the revolutionary element in the island is opposed to granting everything that Congress demanded. The principal objection which this element advanced against the adoption of the Platt amendment, observes the correspondent of the Press, was that "the amendment is in violation of the pledges made by Congress." The correspondent has no patience with such an objection. "This talk of the United States ever having made any pledges to the Cubans," he asserts in his most contemptuous style, "is ridiculous. Where are the Cubans to whom this pledge was made? The few thousand men who composed the revolutionary army scattered around on inaccessible hilltops and in swamps were certainly in no position to demand a pledge or to receive one. To talk of the United States having made a pledge to these people is absurd." Then, as if to dispose of the question for all time, the correspondent of the Press flatly asserts, that the Teller resolution was "a mere declaration of one Congress that could not bind another." That is to say, the Fifty-sixth Congress could promise the world to make Cuba a free and independent State, while the Fifty-sixth could proceed to fasten an American collar around the necks of the Cubans. There would be nothing disgraceful in a change of policy, nothing inconsistent, nothing to prove that the Government of the United States is not the best and most enlightened in the world. It is perfectly honorable and fair to blow hot and cold through the mouths of separate and successive Congresses.

Although the United States has been in the world power business for only a little more than two years, it has assumed all the airs and ways of a veteran. In our parochial days, says the Baltimore Sun, we were foolish enough to be sensitive about national obligations, and actually were so innocent as to mean what we said. There is an end to that sort of thing now, however, and the time is fast approaching when our diplomacy will take rank with that of Russia and China, which we long believed was of a superlatively vicious character. The day is not far off when our statesmen will be able to give Li Hung Chang, the Sultan of Turkey and the head of the Foreign Office at St. Petersburg all the trump cards and beat

them out in the game. European diplomats have often asserted that popular governments are at a disadvantage in negotiating agreements with monarchical governments. Our statesmen are proving, however, that "getters" purposes the American plan is much the best. One Congress may adopt a resolution declaring that white is white. The Congress which succeeds it may find that it would be "to the interest of the country" that white should be pronounced black, or red, or yellow, or any color which might prove most profitable. A mere declaration by one Congress cannot bind the next Congress. The European diplomat who plays against that game is bound to be beaten, as his opponent has all the advantage of marked cards and loaded dice. It is to be regretted that Cuba is the first victim of our new world-power statecraft. But we had to make a start, and unfortunately the Cubans seemed to be an easy mark.

Having rejected the terms offered by the Fifty-sixth Congress, Cuba must now await the pleasure of the Fifty-seventh, which does not meet until December. It is to be feared that this body will not regard the Teller resolution with more respect than the Congress which adopted the Platt amendment. Pending action by the Fifty-seventh Congress Cuba will continue to be governed from Washington as it has been for the past two years.

The Looting of China by the Powers.

The European powers seem to be on the point of giving the world another exhibition of their looting propensities. Their claims upon China for indemnity, it is said, will exceed \$400,000,000—a sum which trustworthy authorities declare it will be impossible for the Chinese Government to pay. An extraordinary feature of the proposed spoliation of a helpless people is the fact that demands for large sums are made by European governments which have scarcely any interests in China and whose subjects sustained little loss during the Boxer uprising. As China is unable to resist any demands, however, the little countries evidently hope to get their share of the loot. Spain, Holland, Belgium and Portugal took no part in the military operations and sent neither soldiers nor sailors to China. Still, each one of these countries has filed a claim for indemnity and expects to get some of the spoils. Their claims, together with those of Italy and Austria, amount to \$100,000,000—a sum equal to about one half of the amount which China would be able to pay by increasing taxation.

China has been deeply humiliated by the terms imposed by the powers. To add to the injury by compelling the Imperial Government to pay an enormous indemnity would be not only unjustifiable, but disgraceful. The allies have already done entirely too much looting in the name of civilization. Further plundering should not be encouraged, even if it takes the form of indemnity.

The Wisdom of Benjamin Franklin

We all know how the canteen has been treated by the modern ideas of virtue, says the New York Journal.

The soldier is forbidden to get what he wants, with his friends, at a reasonable price, and under cheerful conditions. He is forced to buy villainous rum in villainous dives. Get out of fair treatment, he gets delirium tremens, and the Prohibitionists are happy.

We should like all to read the following extract from the autobiography of Benjamin Franklin and compare it with the present idea:

"We had for our chaplain," says the eminent philosopher, "a zealous Presbyterian minister. Mr. Beatty, who complained to me that the men did not generally attend his prayers and exhortations."

"When they enlisted they were promised, besides pay and provisions, a gill of rum a day, which was punctually served out to them, half in the morning and the other half in the evening, and I observed that they were punctual in attending to receive it; upon which I said to Mr. Beatty:

"It is perhaps below the dignity of your profession to act as steward of the rum, but if you were only to distribute it out after prayers you would have them all about you."

"He liked the thought, undertook the task, and with the help of a few hands to measure out the liquor executed it to his satisfaction, and never were prayers more generally and more punctually attended."

HON. JOHN J. LENTZ

The Distinguished Ohioan Will be Missed.

Of the many statesmen who have been retired temporarily from public life owing to the corrupt machinations of Hanna, Heath & Co., perhaps the greatest loss is that stalwart German Democrat Hon. John J. Lentz, of Ohio. He had incurred the enmity of McKinley because he knew so well the peculiar peccadilloes of that oleaginous disciple of Pecksniff and Machiavelli, and had never lost an opportunity to expose them or to bury his poniard in the tough hide of Mark Hanna. So "the cradle and the grave" were robbed to carry his district for a Republican, which was done by the narrow majority of 16. Mr. Lentz has entered a contest which will be watched with interest.

At the close of Congress he delivered a speech which is marked by his usual boldness and originality. It marks out a path for the Democracy which, if followed, will in our mind lead to success. Mr. Lentz is not only a critic of the corrupt and dangerous methods of the Republican party, but is a constructive statesman of high order pointing out a policy for his own party. We reprint his speech in part, with the assurance of our editorial support in the consummation of his policy of Continental expansion:

While our "plain duty" to the Filipino should insure our granting them self government, duty to ourselves would still more strongly point to that course. It is almost unnecessary to state that the Philippine islands can never be of any material benefit to the masses of the American people, however much the lands and franchises may enrich a few exploiters. On the other hand, we have spent, and are spending, and must perforce continue to spend, hundreds of millions of dollars to guard them from within and without. It will be remembered that they are surrounded by nations which may at any moment become hostile to us, and without an immense navy and enormous expense we are forever to be at the mercy of any combination of these nations.

Today we are humbly submitting to Great Britain on that account. Already we have permitted her to take our territory and our citizens in Alaska. She harbors the Filipino junta at Hong Kong, openly plotting against us, and we dare not say her say. She built the American Pacific Railroad as a military base immediately on our northern borders, and now she is about to build a parallel line in case the Northern Pacific should at any time be blocked. She has sent Sir Edward Warren, her greatest military engineer, to Canada, and has arbitrarily seized the island of Anticosti for the purpose of fortifying it. She is delaying the building of the Nicaragua Canal to keep closed that means of connection with the Pacific Ocean, and is attempting, with our acquiescence and virtual assistance, the subjugation of two sister republics in South Africa. She controls the Straits of Gibraltar and Suez Canal, and we are thus completely at her mercy for peaceable transit to the Philippines by that route. When we were confined to our own illimitable and inexhaustible continent, the surface of which has only been scratched, and the resources of which have barely been touched, we were masters of the situation. We were truly a "world power."

Today we are a world merchant, seeking whom we may please. We have been befogged, befuddled, and betrayed by England. It was said, "Beware of the Greeks even when bearing gifts." The same is true of England. With the honeyed phrases about the Anglo Saxon race, and blood being thicker than water, she has coaxed a few pinhead politicians and hypocritical plutocrats into the State Department. She told the Paris peace commission that 5,000 soldiers would be sufficient to hold the Philippines. Instead, it takes 75,000. Who pays? We. Who is weakened? We.

But her prime object in all the diplomacy by which she has fooled us so completely is to take our minds off Canada. She knew that the war fever had only been whetted by our brush with Spain, and she succeeded only too well in drawing a herding across the track leading to our northern neighbor.

Hence the betrayal of our ideals. In our present humiliating predicament we find hostile territory in Cuba and the Philippines, the South American Republics rendered uneasy and suspicious, perfidious Albion surrounding us on every side and constantly strengthening her position, the faith of millions of our own people in our Constitution shaken. Our condition is truly lamentable. Had we granted Cuba and the Philippines self government asking only such naval and coaling stations as we deemed necessary, and which would have been freely given, we would not only have been a world power, but a world master. We could have insisted on Canada being given autonomy or annexed to the United States. The spirit of the Monroe Doctrine has been violated by her sending troops to fight in South Africa, her territory being made a recruiting ground for Great Britain.

Suppose we are in difficulty with England, as is inevitable, for the present "era of good feeling" will only last till England succeeds in South Africa. Would not England import troops from South Africa and Australia to fight us? Would the Dutch of South Africa not be justified in coming over to avenge them-

selves for the moles and horses, aye, and the men, we have sent to help to destroy them forever? Would the Irish and the Germans who helped to save the Union which the English sought to destroy be so willing to fight the English legions as they were before this unwarrantable and unwise understanding with the infamous and mendacious Chamberlain? What we should have done, if we desired expansion, was to take Canada. She has illimitable acres of public lands. She has millions of square miles of forests. We need the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence as an outlet to the Atlantic as much as we need the Mississippi as an outlet to the Gulf of Mexico. Jefferson, that man of peace, was willing to go to war to secure Louisiana and Florida. The great Seaward took Alaska as an entering wedge to the annexation of Canada.

We need her to complete our continental Republic. Her people are congenial, and the vast majority of them willing for the change. It would benefit them even more than it would us. We could, without danger of interference, develop our domestic institutions on national lines, as the people of New Zealand and Australia are doing. Large armies and huge navies, with ever recurring and ever increasing cost, would be unnecessary. The best and bravest of our sons would not be condemned to death or a living hell by reason of residence in torrid climes. Our free institutions would not be turned into autocratic despotism. In the play of Quo Vadis the cowardly and learned Petronius is told by the miserable Cesar that he has "lived too long." Mr. McKinley, in effect, says the same thing day after day when he removes men from office. Everything depends on the whim of one man, and arbitrary power will make even a good man bad, and a bad man a demon. Our institutions need development in accordance with principles of justice and equity. Instead of concentration of power, we need a balance which conserves the principles of individual liberty without weakening the state. To do this, the power of patronage must be taken away from the President as far as possible.

In this way the popularity of Executive action can be effectively passed upon at least every two years. As a matter of fact, a state of anarchy has existed in the United States and Territories for the past four years. No one knows what may be done next. The programme foreshadowed one week is departed from the next. Even judicial decisions are reversed to order. Murder is constantly on the increase in the United States, and wholesale murder, under the guise of war, is chronic in the Philippines, while bribery and corruption are wholesale at home and abroad. To compensate for this there is a plethora of wealth in the hands of a few, and the glittering baubles of empire held up to dazzle the oncoming masses.

The steamroller solution, if we are to go into the expansion business, is to annex Canada and to do it now while England is in difficulty. Turn the Philippines over to her own people, who have shown themselves amply able to take care of themselves, and protect them till they are on sure foundation, securing coaling and naval stations. In this way we will have the friendship of a nation of ten millions in the Orient, guarding the security of our interests in that quarter; we will have disarmed the suspicions of our southern neighbors; we will have our great Republic strengthened from the Arctic to the Equator, impregnable in its solidarity, and probably peacefully acquiring the country to the Isthmus of Panama at no distant day, and thus we can go on and on in paths of peace, which are vouchsafed to men of good will on earth.

Too Bad about the Czar.

It seems that the poor Russian Czar is in a state of nervous prostration. He cannot sleep or eat, according to the New York Journal, and his dear family is really as nervous as he is. Too bad! isn't it?

But there is another side to the case. When the students in the Russian colleges objected to being drafted into the army wholesale as a discipline and against their will, the Cossacks were turned loose upon them.

These Cossack gentlemen carried whips with numerous lashes and a bullet attached to the end of each lash. They beat the students with these whips, and ten of them died.

These ten students (among a great many others) are removed from all danger of nervous prostration and indigestion. They have been done for.

The Czar remains, suffering with his nerves. We dare say that he will suffer, and that all his descendants will suffer with him, until these men, beaten to death, for asserting their rights, shall have been properly avenged.

Nervous prostration is a small punishment for murder. "An eye for an eye, and a tooth for a tooth" comes nearer to the real thing. If in America we should hear that the Czar and nine of his relatives were beaten to death with loaded whips, we should feel inclined to say that the score was about settled—as all men are theoretically even here—and casually we should predict that the next Czar would arm his Cossacks more mildly.

The Kaiser has ordered that the study of English shall replace that of French in the high schools of Germany.

FOREIGN NEWS.

Translated and Selected from leading European papers for the SENTINEL.

ENGLAND.

Catholic and the Accession Oath.

Liverpool Mercury, March 20.

Lord Salisbury often rivals the "brutal frankness" of Bismarck. Having to deal with a resolution proposed by Lord Herries on the subject of the oath taken by the sovereign at the opening of the session, he stigmatized the section to which Roman Catholics object as "indecent violence." He could scarcely have employed a stronger phrase. Before the obnoxious words can be deleted, however, the Legislature must consider the question with great circumspection. There are many people, "perfectly sincere, but not very wise"—another characteristic turn of speech—who would be disposed to misunderstand the concession; and a Minister has to remember that the franchise is wide, and that, without adopting Carlyle's sweeping dictum, a large proportion of the electorate may be unreasonably apprehensive of a trifling with the Protestant succession. However, an investigation will be undertaken by the Government as to "whether the language can be modified advantageously without diminishing its efficacy." Lord Herries seemed to be satisfied with this promise, and it is really all that could be expected.

Scotsman, March 20.

Lord Salisbury informed the House that until he heard Lord Kinnaird's speech he was not aware there was any difference of opinion in regard to the question, but Lord Salisbury's ignorance is often as remarkable as his knowledge. Even if the two houses were to appoint their most eminent theologians to serve on the committee the result of its labors would have to undergo the heavy artillery of ultra-Protestantism criticism, and the more invidious attacks of those who wish to minimize the differences between the Church of England and that of Rome. Nor is it altogether certain that any alterations would really satisfy the Roman Catholics. When N. W. man spoke of the oath as a great national act of apostasy, he referred as much to its substance as its terms. This, however, is their concern. While the appointment of a committee does not by any means commit the government to anything, and while it may yield no practical result, it is at least a gracious concession to a demand that has evoked a considerable amount of sympathy from the Protestants.

Belfast News Letter, March 20.

The action of the Government is very extraordinary. If Lord Salisbury admits that the efficacy of the oath as a security must be served why is he so ready to consent to a change, or to grant a committee of inquiry when no inquiry is needed? It is stated that the oath in its present form is offensive to Roman Catholics, but it were altered to ease them far larger numbers of Protestants of these realms would be very seriously displeased, and with just cause. While the Roman Catholics have full liberty in these islands, it must be remembered that this is a Protestant country. The Government appear to be exceedingly ready to grant concessions to the Roman Catholics; and yet we should like to know what special considerations are shown to Protestants in countries where they are in a minority. Has the Roman Catholic Church ever altered its offensive attitude towards Protestants in describing them as "heretics" and so on?

Kutly Risks Iner asling.

London Spectator.

Mr. Sidney Low is right in saying that the power of the Kings has increased of late, or, as Mr. Balfour put it, they have become more "important factors" in the political life of their dominions; but they have to endure at least one unfortunate consequence of that, for them, encouraging change. The importance of their lives, and consequently the danger to their lives, has increased as much as their power. When a single man gathers up the reins of authority into his own hands, so that he alone is the mark for every Anarchist, for every man who thinks himself wronged by his Government—a list which includes unnumbered investors and disappointed contractors, as well as dismissed officials—and for the great army of the half-starved, the danger from whom is very serious indeed. They are rarely suspected, they require no intelligible motive, but kill, as the kleptomaniac steals, because there is a shining object before their eyes, and they have none of the ordinary fears of arrest and execution. * * * It is worth while, therefore, to consider for a moment whether it is possible by precaution to guarantee a sovereign's or a President's life.

We fear it is nearly impossible unless the sovereign condemns himself as Alexander III. practically did to imprisonment for life in his own palace. Penalties appear entirely useless, for the semi-lunatics take no heed of them, and the assassins proper are of necessity indifferent to a death, which in a considerable proportion of cases they are prepared to inflict upon themselves. Imprisonment for life "face quietly, being perhaps buoyed up by an undying hope of revolution, and Christian Princes can hardly inflict torture, which again would probably be no deterrent, for no torture could be worse than being broken on the wheel and put to 1700 assassins knew that they ran that risk, and nevertheless assassinated. Police prevention is not perfect, though it does much, for if it were perfect there would be no assassinations, and there are. The problem is therefore to pre-

vent a man in the street from reaching the King either by bombshell, bullet or knife, and experience shows that it is nearly, if not quite, insoluble. * * * A King in a modern State has no more right to die by assassination than he has to inflict any other useless mistreatment upon his people. He must not shrink in battle, because that dispirits his armies, but for a man in his position facing assassins is not courage but foolhardiness. * * * Kings have been guilty of almost every crime, but we can remember but one in history who ever betrayed his people for a bribe. Any how, the Kings survive everything, from subjugation, as in Prussia, to revolt, as in Spain, and the man who could devise a scheme to make their assassination impossible would do a service to the world. He would return to monarchs their sanity, and therefore their judicial sense.

Botha's Reply to Kitchener.

London Morning Post, March 20.

When the war began Mr. Kruger appealed in exorbitant terms to the God of Battles, and the appeal was taken up in express terms by the Colonial Secretary in behalf of the British Government. After that it is for the British Government to overpower the Boers. War is the appeal to force, and the proposal to abandon force and to have recourse to argument or negotiation is usually a sign that the side which makes it had enough of force, and feels unable to go on with the struggle. In this case the proposals for negotiation seem to have emanated from the British. The Boers have given no sign of giving up the contest; there is no sign that they are despaired; the leaders in the field do not acknowledge themselves beaten. So long as that is the case there is no room for parleys, no place for the diplomatist; the soldier has yet to finish his task. We fail to understand how any kind of terms granted to the Boers short of unconditional surrender could in any way simplify the task of the British Government. To buy off Botha and De Wet by promises and guarantees of what the British Government will or will not do hereafter might indeed lighten the labors of the War Office, but would immensely complicate the future labors of Mr. Chamberlain and of his lieutenant, Sir Alfred Milner.

Newcastle Daily Chronicle, March 20.

It was stated last week, and the statement has never been contradicted, that a son of the notorious Erasmus whom we captured the other day has been travelling about England buying stores for the Boers; and it is absolutely certain that both men and material have been shipped to them. We are not at all sure that these cargoes have not reached their destination. No shipmastering expedition has, at any rate, been captured by our warships, nor, so far as we are aware, has one been observed by them. On February 27 Lord Kitchener issued an order that two days previously Gen. French had taken a howitzer from the Boers. How did the Boers get that howitzer? To the best of our recollection, howitzers were not included in the Boer armory at the commencement of the campaign, and we ourselves did not drop any until the war had been in progress for several months. In our hands they have proved very useful in mountainous country. Have the Boers recognized their utility, and ordered some from Europe, and has the order been fulfilled? We will not commit ourselves to a definite answer to the question. But we do maintain that the coast ought to be more carefully watched than it has been, or can be with the number of ships on the African station.

Manchester Guardian, March 20.

Nationality is a more vital force than is readily credited by Englishmen, whose own national liberty has been so long secure that it is possible for them to forget the sacrifices made to maintain it. It is, to all appearance, the destiny of the Boers to lose their national independence in the present struggle; but Ireland lost her independence centuries ago, and her sense of nationality has never yet ceased to assert itself. In the history of Ireland, of Poland, of the Dutch ancestors of the Boers, and of the Boers themselves is any guide, the Government's assumption becomes doubtful indeed. Of course there remains one way out—the method of Nebuchadnezzar. If the moral sense of the country would permit it would perhaps be practically possible to persist in a war of extermination to the bitter end. The alternative is to find a basis on which Dutch and English can live together. We do not yet know what steps the Government have taken to find such a basis, and we are certainly not prepared to pronounce it impossible to do so until the experiment has been tried by men free from all responsibility for the initiation of the war.

Leeds Mercury, March 20.

General Botha's answer is beyond question the most disappointing news that has reached this country from the scene of hostilities for a considerable period. It must sadly disconcert all who fondly believe that, as soon as the Boers received a definite assurance that self government would be conceded to them at the earliest opportunity, they would at once lay down their arms. It is only too evident that these sanguine persons were counting without a knowledge of the determination of the Boers still in arms.

These dispatches which reach this country concerning the alleged attempts on the life of the Czar and regarding his mental and physical condition of health, in every case come from Berlin, a circumstance which is sufficient to cause them to be regarded with suspicion and distrust. For Berlin has long been celebrated for its newspaper fabrications regarding the Russian imperial family, which are, as a general rule, due to attempts to influence the rise and fall of stocks, especially Russian stocks on the bourse.